ments .- Rawlings v. Stewart, 22.

On a bill for specific performance the defendant being unable to make a valid title, he was ordered to make the plaintiff a reasonable allowance for such improvements as would be beneficial to any subsequent possessor.—Rawlings v. Carroll, 76.

A bona fide possessor ignorant of his adversary's title may be allowed for such improvements as enhance the value of the property.—Strike's case, 76.

A mala fide possessor can have no claim to any such allowance, 77; McKomb v.

Kankey, 363.

A claim by a bona fide possessor for improvements may be discounted from that made against him for rents and profits or for waste.-Strike's case, 79; Rawlings v. Carroll, 76.

A mala fide meddler cannot be allowed any thing for taxes, &c. in relief of the property any more than for improve-ments.—Strike's case, 83.

In opposition to a claim for dower the heir can have no allowance for meliorations and improvements.—H. K. Chase's case, 232.

A decree for the sale of land may be of such a nature as to leave the claim for improvements to be adjusted by further directions .- Strike's case, 70.

INFANT.

Money will not be paid out to a guardian ad litem of an infant party.—Corrie v.

Clarke, 85.

Land might, before the act of 1785, ch. 72, s. 5, have been sold to pay debts with the consent, according to the act of 1773, ch. 7, s. 2, of the guardian ad litem of the infant heir .- Pue v. Dorsey, 140.

The proceeds of the sale of land devised to a woman for life, remainder to her children, paid to her husband as their guardian on his giving bond .- Wells v.

Roloson, 456, 457.

After a sale to effect a division the shares awarded to the infants may be paid to their mother on her giving bond to account as their guardian.—Spurrier v. Spurrier, 477.

INJUNCTION.

Orders to stay proceedings or the execution of a decree of this court treated as injunctions .- Burch v. Scott, 123; Clap-

ham v. Thompson, 123.

Where an injunction has been obtained against an executor or administrator, it will be sufficient if the answer states facts which must have been within the knowledge of the testator only, upon the belief of the executor or administrator to have the injunction dissolved.-Coale v. Chase, 137

ed for repairs and lasting improve- In what cases on the bill alone an injunction, if prayed, may be granted, and how the bill must be verified.—Jones v. Magill, 190; Jenifer v. Stone, 189; Paul v. Nixon, 201.

How and under what circumstances on the coming in of the answer there may

be a motion to dissolve, 180.

The rule further proceedings and the exceptions to the answer may be heard and acted upon together with the motion to dissolve, 181; Gibson v. Tilton, 353.

An injunction in extraordinary cases is ranted upon terms suited to the peculiar circumstances, allowing a motion to dissolve to be heard at an early day. Jones v. Magill, 182; McMechen v. Story, 184; Jenifer v. Stone, 188; Diffenderffer v. Hillen, 190; Williamson v. Wilson, 419.

Under the same bill a ne exeat as well as an injunction may be granted.-Bryson

v. Petty, 182.

An injunction may be partially dissolved on the defendant's giving bond, 182.

Where an injunction has been granted on terms, leave to amend the bill will only be granted without prejudice to those terms .- McMechen v. Story, 184.

A defenfant without waiting a subpæna may answer immediately, and thereupon move for a dissolution, 185.

Where the injunction has been granted with leave to move for a dissolution without answer, if the defendant does answer it will be considered on the motion, 185.

Delay in applying for an injunction affords a strong reason for refusing it, 185.

The discretionary power of commissioners to lay out a new road or street cannot be restrained by injunction. - Worthington v. Bicknell, 187; Diffenderffer v. Hillen, 190; Pascault v. The Commissioners of Baltimore, 584.

An injunction to stay the levying of what is due when the party insists on levying

what is not due.—Jenifer v. Stone, 188. Where there are several defendants all must answer before there can be a motion to dissolve; but to this there are exceptions .- Jones v. Magill, 190; Stewart v. Barry, 192; Williams v. Hall, 194: Chapline v. Betty, 197; Tong v. Oliver, 199.

When the chancellor is absent from the city where the court is held, an injunction may be issued with the sanction of a disinterested solicitor, subject to the approval of the chancellor.—Stewart v. Berry, 191.

An injunction cannot be dissolved on a consideration of the opposing title. without an answer to the interrogatories of the bill, 192.

If there be a defect in the injunction bond, the injunction will not therefore be dis-